

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : Tetsujiro KONDO et al.
Serial No. : 10/631,348
Filed : July 31, 2003
For : INFORMATION PROCESSING APPARATUS
Examiner : Anand S. Rao
Group Art Unit : 2621
Confirmation No. : 3471

745 Fifth Avenue,
New York, NY 10151

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted
via Electronic Filing Services on May 14, 2008.

Valerie Gray

(Name of person signing transmittal)


Signature

May 14, 2008
Date of Signature

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the second Restriction Requirement dated May 1, 2008,
having a one-month term for response set to expire on June 2, 2008 (June 1 is a Sunday),
wherein restriction was required among the claims as follows:

Group I claims 1, 12-13, 22, 33-34, 43, 55, 64 and 67, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "motion vector detection/generation in non-compressed images;"

Group II claims 2, 10-11, 19-20, 23, 31-32, 40-41, 44, 52-53, 61-62, 65-66, 68-69 and 78-8, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "object and scene measurement with the camera and object moved relative towards each other;"

Group III claims 3-4, 24-25 and 45-46, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "camera motion processing and associated sensor processing and output to a chair (camera combined with diverse art device);"

Group IV claims 5, 26, 47, 44-47, 70-74 and 76-77, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "panoramic image generation;"

Group V claims 6, 9, 27, 30, 48 and 51, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "motion vector detection/generation with centroidal tracking in non-compressed images;"

Group VI claims 14-15, 21, 35-36, 42, 56-57, 63 and 75, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "motion vector detection/generation in compressed images (i.e. conversion coefficient generation); and

Group VII claims 18, 39 and 61, which the Examiner characterized as being directed to "motion vector detection/generation using feature points (i.e. representative points) in compressed images."

This is the second restriction requirement in this application. The first restriction requirement, dated January 15, 2008, required restriction among only two groups of claims. In response to the January 15, 2008 restriction requirement, Applicants' representative respectfully requested a regrouping of the claims to better reflect the differences between the two groups, namely, the group that recites vibration generation and the group that does not recite vibration generation. In response to this request, the Examiner issued the instant restriction requirement.

Consistent with the requirements of the MPEP, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I claims 1, 12-13, 22, 33-34, 43, 55, 64 and 67. Applicants respectfully traverse the present restriction requirement for the following reasons:

First, claim 44 is included in both the Group II and Group IV claims. Similarly, claims 45 and 46 are included in both the Group III and Group IV claims. Likewise, claim 61 is included in both the Group II and Group VII claims. Thus, Applicants cannot properly identify which claims belong in which group. Consequently, Applicants cannot determine which group of claims, as proposed by the Examiner, should be elected.

Second, claims 54 and 60 are omitted from the groups identified by the Examiner. Here too, this omission makes it difficult for Applicants to properly determine which claims should be examined in response to this restriction requirement, especially since it is not known if these omitted claims will be examined or omitted in response to Applicants' election.

Third, while not prohibited, the Examiner requires restriction, in many instances, between an independent claim and claims that depend from the independent claim. This would appear to present a significant burden on the Office when divisional applications are filed to re-present the dependent claims because a duplicate search would be needed for the dependent claims, especially after the very same, or similar, search would have been conducted for the independent claim.

Applicants' representative continues to believe that the most logical restriction requirement in the present application would be between those claims, on the one hand, that recite vibration generation; and those claims, on the other hand, that do not recite vibration

generation. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that a proper restriction requirement would be between:

Group A claims 1, 6, 9-15, 18-22, 27, 30-36, 39-43, 48, 51-57 and 60-77; and

Group B claims 2-5, 23-26, 44-47 and 78-80.

Reconsideration of the instant restriction requirement and issuance of a new requirement based on the foregoing is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800